

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended with an eye toward correcting the informalities noted on page 2, paragraph 2, of the Office Action.

Claims 6 and 7 have been amended to correct the informalities noted on page 2, paragraph 5 of the Office Action.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 and 2 have been amended with an eye toward overcoming this rejection. Claims 3-8 depend on amended claim 1, and therefore, claims 1-8 are believed to be in compliance with the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1 and 3-7 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seattle FilmWorks; and claims 2 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Seattle FilmWorks in view of Afifi et al.

By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. The features set forth in amended claim 1 are supported by the description on page 1, lines 27-30, page 2, lines 4-10, and page 3, lines 2-4 of the present specification. Seattle FilmWorks discloses an on-line delivery service that allows a user to view and selectively download digital pictures, after they are processed by a lab. Seattle FilmWorks also discloses that two numbers have to be entered: a customer number, and, for instance, a roll number.

A problem solved by the present invention as defined in amended claim 1 is to improve existing processes, by making available processed and digitized images rapidly, in a very confidential way, by limiting errors in the identification of a user's message service address by a processing laboratory; by making available to the user the images on a server, without his/her message service address being accessible to anyone other than the processing laboratory personnel with whom there is no contact; and by providing for the claimed method without additional human intervention by the laboratory (see page 1, line 32 to page 2, line 2; and page 5, lines 27-31 of the present specification). In fact, the problem is to avoid prior art drawbacks by preventing access to the message service address indicated on an order sent to the laboratory to everyone other than laboratory

personal; and to avoid risks of errors on the order in writing or reading the user's address (see page 1, lines 30-34 of the specification).


Amended claim 1 defines a process to solve the problem above. Neither Seattle FilmWorks nor Afifi et al. discloses this problem, or a means to solve it. As mentioned in the Office Action, the steps of recovering a number which uniquely identifies the terminal by means of which the user sent the code, associating the code identifying the at least one image with the number identifying the terminal, and defining an address on the server by integrating the number identifying the terminal, is not disclosed or suggested by Seattle FilmWorks. Absent Applicant's disclosure, there would be no teaching, showing or suggestion of the above features in Seattle FilmWorks. Afifi et al. only teaches the use of a telephone number to identify a system user.

In consequence, even in combining the teaching of Seattle FilmWorks with Afifi et al., a person skilled in the art would not have obtained the whole process defined in amended claim 1, because there is no indication in these cited references of a method that can prevent everyone, other than personal of the laboratory, from having access to a message service address indicated on an order sent to the laboratory by a user of a terminal, and avoids risks of errors on the order in writing or reading the address. Thus, the person skilled in the art would not have obtained, without inventiveness, amended claim 1 which solves an unrecognized problem in the cited prior art references. Accordingly, the features of amended claim 1 considered as a whole are not shown or suggested in the applied references, whether considered individually or in combination, and would not have been obvious. Claims 2-8 which depend from claim 1 are also considered inventive when taken in combination with claim 1.

It is believed that pending claims are clear and definite, and if any issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

In view of the foregoing comments, it is submitted that the inventions defined by each of claims 1-8 are patentable, and a favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,



David A. Novais  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 33,324

DAN/lid  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-588-2727  
Facsimile: 585-477-1148